

Fawn Lake Committee
Minutes of Meeting
June 16, 2015
Department of Public Works Conference Room
314 Great Road, Bedford, MA

PRESENT: John Zupkus, Acting Chair; Michael Barbehenn; Schorr Berman;
Elizabeth Cowles; Margot Fleischman; Linda Oustinow; Bill Simons

Adrienne St. John, DPW; Dennis Freeman, DPW
Elizabeth Bagdonas, Conservation Administrator
Matthew Lundsted, CEI Consultants

ABSENT: Allan Wirth, Sharon McDonald

Acting Chair John Zupkus called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. The draft minutes of May 6th were reviewed, with a Committee request to submit a revision with less detail.

Ms. Fleischman presented the results of the pair-wise ranking in a new table intended to represent the committee's consensus. Mr. Barbehenn saw subtle differences and thought more discussion was needed on the values, questioning the #1 choice. Other committee members believed that it was meant to be an overall guide, and that there would be later opportunities to analyze values. Other issues raised were definitions and the need to relate methods to the ranking. Ms. St. John recommended running the methods through each part of the matrix, with some attention given to time required for permitting; others were concerned about the potential effect of weighting on future discussion. There were varying opinions regarding how to score each method, the potential for ranking to skew future analysis and evaluation, and the consideration to be given to past lake management history. Mr. Simons stated that the discussion seemed similar to hazardous waste remediation projects, using some of the same descriptions as an excellent way to ascertain values. He offered to do a DEP search to find out which methods might create the most value, and research pond projects in Canton and Milford. Mr. Lundsted stated that CEI collected some of its information from the Army Corps of Engineers, which had developed support documents over a period of 14 years. He also commented that cultural value was often the core of successful funding.

Mr. Barbehenn stated that he agreed with all results except those regarding longevity, noting that hydroraking cost vs. duration had been rejected by the Town, leading to the possibility that the best value for the Town might be longevity. Mr. Simons and Mr. Barbehenn both favored a process of applying an "even playing field" and a "net present worth" or cost benefit analysis of project cost and longevity. Mr. Lundsted commented that some methods became less effective over time, and it was agreed that changing quality and period of effectiveness need to be captured in the analysis.

Other questions and issues raised were the effect of choosing only one method when there are other solutions, the idea of high-medium-low ranking, how various methods compare against the criteria/values, recreation as a “tie-breaker”, eliminating the time required for permitting from the decision-making, and the difficulty of comparing things that are all important.

Consensus was reached on a second (high-medium-low) ranking; Ms. Fleischman will prepare another table to display these results.

The committee proceeded to a discussion of any options that could be eliminated; comments included eliminating an entire column, leaving the matrix as is, and using some options as controls. Mr. Lundsted stated that biodredging has not worked this far north; Mr. Zupkus added that this method left the biomass in place. Mr. Simons suggested a hybrid approach. Additional combination columns could be added, rather than eliminating an option that could be paired with something else. The committee agreed to eliminate biodredging as a stand-alone option. Mr. Simons suggested starting with a conceptual site model as a place holder (e.g. fishing, biodiversity). A cartoon could be developed of a general cross-section with an exaggerated vertical scale, to assist in deciding what the committee would want before getting too far in the process. Mr. Barbehenn suggested coming up with specific combinations: Mr. Lundsted offered to develop a table for this, stating also that each option could stand alone. For example, every option could be combined with dredging. An “add-on” could be combined with one of the major options, providing an “additional benefit to a dredge”. Mr. Berman stated that the depth of the lake was the major issue; Mr. Simons stated that “add-ons” would make a project more palatable.

There was some discussion of the maximum depth obtainable, with Mr. Lundsted responding that 20’ was not practicable; 10’ was possible in some areas. He suggested a central dredge with side area hydroraking, a combination that would be easier to cost. The size of the lake was the major limitation. Mr. Simons advised keeping the analysis simple to begin with, of various possible approaches.

The committee agreed to look into other town projects, perhaps schedule site visits, and obtain information on the cultural aspects of such projects.

The committee agreed to schedule the next meeting on July 29, 2015

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.
Minutes prepared by Elizabeth Bagdonas.

Minutes approved at meeting of July 29, 2015.